United Nations A/C.1/58/PV.15

General Assembly
Fifty-eighth session

Official Records

First Committee
15th meeting
Friday, 24 October 2003, 10 a.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Sareva ..... (Finland)

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Agenda items 62 to 80 (*continued*)

Thematic discussion on item subjects and the introduction and consideration of all draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security items

The Chairman: Delegations are invited today to make statements on related matters of disarmament and international security, as well as on international security. They are also invited to continue introducing draft resolutions.

Mr. Al-Shamsi (United Arab Emirates) (*spoke in Arabic*): The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones has been given universal recognition for its importance in confidence-building between States and in achieving regional and international peace and security. Such zones have gained wider recognition, especially after the adoption of a number of guidelines and recommendations by the Disarmament Commission for the purpose of promoting those objectives and for maintaining the zones that are contained in the relevant international treaties and conventions on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons free from such weapons, in accordance with international law.

The Middle East should not be an exception to this rule even if Israel, the only State in the region to possess this type of dangerous weapons, intransigently refuses to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and other relevant international treaties.

We therefore call on the international community, through this important Committee, to reiterate the importance of the following.

First, we must condemn Israel's repeated violations of relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, including Council resolutions 487 (1981) and 687 (1991), the resolutions on the Middle East adopted by the two NPT Review and Extension Conferences held in 1995 and 2000, as well as other resolutions addressing the threat of Israel's nuclear weapons to the Middle East.

Secondly, the United Nations and the major Powers must fulfil their responsibilities and exert all possible pressure on Israel's Government to compel it to dismantle its nuclear weapons arsenal, accede to the NPT without delay and place all its nuclear facilities under the International Atomic Energy Agency's (IAEA) comprehensive safeguards regime, in order to achieve the goal of universal adherence to the NPT in the Middle East and enhance measures for confidence-building, security and peace among the States in the region.

Thirdly, all States must refrain from extending any kind of assistance to Israel — including scientific, technological and financial assistance — that could be used to produce, develop and modernize its nuclear weapons programmes and that could lead to

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

03-57850 (E)

environmental, health and security catastrophes in the region as a whole.

Our ability to confront, without discrimination, those parties that do not abide by international legality will determine the future of this Committee.

We also hope that the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/58/L.22 and A/C.1/58/L.23 will receive your support.

Mr. Adji (Indonesia): I would like to speak first of all on the issue of confidence-building measures, including transparency in armaments.

In South-East Asia, confidence-building processes are growing, becoming more specific and being promoted under the auspices of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and its regional forum. For quite some time now, these combined efforts have contributed to enhancing mutual understanding and trust, promoting greater transparency and strengthening the commitment to maintaining a climate of peace and stability in the region. In recent years, preventive diplomacy has become a guiding force in advancing these objectives.

My delegation has always regarded the availability of information as promoting confidence and the process of disarmament. This has particular importance for the Asia-Pacific region in removing mistrust and miscommunication. In this regard, a number of proposals worthy of consideration have included confidence-building measures on the land and sea elimination of certain types of weapons, restraint in armaments acquisition, transparency in international arms transfer and deployment limitations for external Powers in strategically important areas.

As regards disarmament machinery, my delegation continues to hope for an end to the protracted lack of agreement on a programme of work at the Conference on Disarmament. The unprecedented cross-group initiative of its five former Presidents offers, in our view, a pragmatic approach for adopting an agenda that reflects the priority concerns of all Member States. This has become all the more imperative against the backdrop of a rapidly changing international security environment and hence, widespread concern about the potential consequences of continued immobility in that forum.

The resumption of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament at this critical juncture will mark a turning point in its history, and its integration will have a beneficial impact on our continuing endeavours in arms limitations and disarmament. Indonesia remains optimistic that, at its next session, from January through March, this forum will rise to its responsibility as the sole multilateral negotiating forum by fostering consensus on its programme of work.

As regards the working methods and reallocation of some agenda items of the First Committee, Indonesia, along with other members of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), will continue to accord this issue the importance that it warrants within the overall process of revitalizing the General Assembly. Needless to say, such an exercise requires flexibility and cooperation on the part of all Members.

Mr. Langeland (Norway): My delegation takes the floor to address the resolution contained in document A/C.1/58/L.15 on enhancing the role of the First Committee. The purpose of this process is to make the First Committee more relevant. We are glad that there have been informal consultations on the subject. It is important to maintain the momentum in this process. We consider discussions on enhancing the role of the First Committee as part of the broader efforts to improve the functioning of the General Assembly as called for by the Secretary-General. Our consultations must contribute to the ongoing work in the Working Group on the leadership of the President of the General Assembly. Those two tracks have to be mutually supportive. For that reason, Norway plays an active role in the General Assembly Working Group. We also think that a revitalized First Committee will have positive repercussions for our efforts to further strengthen a multilateral approach to disarmament and non-proliferation.

We welcome draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.15. We also appreciate that consultations are being held on its final wording. It is our hope that the draft resolution can be adopted without a vote.

Mr. U Mya Than (Myanmar): I have the honour and privilege to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.47, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", on behalf of the following sponsors: Algeria, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran,

Jordan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Panama, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Tonga, United Republic of Tanzania, Uganda, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe and my own delegation, Myanmar.

Draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.47 is our traditional draft resolution, which we have tabled every year since 1995. It is sponsored by all the countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and many countries of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM). Although this is not a NAM draft resolution per se, it reflects the views of the overwhelming majority of the NAM countries.

Nuclear disarmament is the highest priority for us in the field of arms control and disarmament. Our vision is a world totally free of nuclear weapons. To that end, we must strive to take incremental steps for the reduction of nuclear weapons, eventually leading to their total elimination. This is reflected in the preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution.

Nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation are substantively linked and interrelated, as well as mutually reinforcing. The two processes must go hand in hand. Let there be no mistake: it is inconceivable to enforce nuclear non-proliferation effectively without a systematic, progressive and irreversible process of nuclear disarmament.

That point is of paramount importance. Some countries place emphasis on the aspect of nuclear non-proliferation, playing down the importance of nuclear disarmament. We note with concern such an approach by some countries at the Review Conferences and Preparatory Committee meetings of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We strongly differ with that approach. We wish to stress that there can be no effective enforcement of nuclear non-proliferation without a systematic, progressive and irreversible process of nuclear disarmament. That message is conveyed and highlighted by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.47 in operative paragraph 2.

The Member States of the United Nations, with the exception of a handful of countries, are also States Parties to the NPT. Under article VI of the NPT, all States Parties have the obligation to pursue in good faith, and to bring to a conclusion, negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control. Moreover, the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference sets out 13 steps for systematic and progressive efforts to achieve the objective of nuclear disarmament. We consider that the "unequivocal undertaking" by the nuclear-weapon States — embodied in the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference — to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals, leading to nuclear disarmament, is of paramount importance. We also attach great importance to the 13 steps for nuclear disarmament, set out in the Final Document of the Conference. We therefore call for the full and effective implementation of the 13 steps for nuclear disarmament by the nuclear-weapon States. Those crucially important points are reflected in the seventh preambular paragraph, as well as in operative paragraphs 2, 11 and 12 of the draft resolution.

Reflecting the views of the overwhelming majority of the NAM Member States, the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/58/L.47 sends a powerful message through a number of substantive paragraphs. In operative paragraph 19, it reiterates its call on the Conference on Disarmament to establish, on a priority basis, an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament early in 2004. It also calls upon the Conference on Disarmament to commence negotiations on a phased programme of nuclear disarmament.

The draft resolution is comprehensive in scope and encompasses crucial interim measures for reducing the nuclear danger, as well. We believe that there is a genuine need to diminish the role of nuclear weapons in strategic doctrines and security policies of Member States to minimize the risk that those weapons will ever be used and to facilitate the process of their total elimination. The nuclear-weapon States are urged, as an interim measure, to de-alert and deactivate immediately their nuclear weapons and to take other concrete measures to reduce further the operational status of their nuclear weapon systems.

Furthermore, the draft resolution calls on the nuclear-weapon States, pending the achievement of the total elimination of nuclear weapons, to agree on an international, legally binding instrument on a joint undertaking not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, and to conclude an internationally and legally binding instrument on security assurances of non-use and non-

threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States.

These crucial interim measures will go a long way in reducing the nuclear danger. We have reflected these important points in operative paragraphs 4, 6 and 8 of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.47 is the most substantive draft resolution on the subject of nuclear disarmament. It promotes and underlines the importance of multilateralism in the field of arms control and disarmament. The draft resolution is, indeed, a road map for nuclear disarmament. It addresses the question of nuclear disarmament in all its aspects, in an in-depth and substantive manner.

For those reasons, I call upon the Member States to lend the draft their overwhelming support, as in previous years, and vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.47.

Mr. Maandi (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): The Algerian delegation would like to express its views on draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.47, entitled "Nuclear disarmament". The draft resolution was introduced by Myanmar, and my country has been a sponsor of the text since the first year it was presented.

My delegation would also like to reiterate its deep belief that security, one and indivisible, must benefit all. As far as my country is concerned, the complete elimination of nuclear weapons is the top priority now more than ever before. We advocate a universal collective security system that can, once and for all, free us from military theories and doctrines concerning nuclear deterrents. The end of the cold war made this theory anachronistic and put the nuclear option in perspective. There are no grounds for still citing outdated doctrines that hamper our progress in nuclear disarmament. Unilateral and bilateral approaches to reducing nuclear weapon stocks are useful and indeed necessary, but they can never fully satisfy our demand for nuclear disarmament. The enormous difficulties facing the nuclear disarmament process and the interest and fundamental role given by security policies to nuclear weapons, is of concern to us today.

This is disturbing because it calls into question commitments made on nuclear disarmament, infringes on the principle of undiminished security for all and discriminates between nuclear and non-nuclear countries. It also concerns us because it encourages other countries to opt for nuclear weapons in order to ensure their own security on the grounds of nuclear deterrence, a philosophy which, unfortunately, still holds good today. The concept of deterrence gives rise to the development and perfection of new kinds of weapons, creates an atmosphere of distrust and further accelerates the arms race. This leads to a selective application of conventions and treaties on nuclear disarmament. Respect for article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) is of legal significance and nuclear countries must comply with it.

The historic commitment made so unequivocally at the Sixth Review Conference of the NPT in 2000, under article VI of the NPT, must absolutely be implemented. To use article VI for the purpose of concluding international agreements which would promote the complete dismantling of nuclear arsenals necessarily involves the rehabilitation and relaunching of the Conference on Disarmament, which is the only multilateral negotiating body on disarmament. Everything must be done to make that multilateral body function again, so that in good faith and without delay, it may engage in negotiations to eliminate these particularly deadly weapons.

Nuclear disarmament cannot be reduced simply to combating horizontal nuclear proliferation. Ending nuclear proliferation in itself is not enough to strengthen international peace and security, but must include effective nuclear disarmament. Vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons has continued against the spirit and letter of the NPT and it has not been possible to stop it. However it could be stopped if we were to abandon our old reflexes and abandon the nuclear doctrine.

The draft resolution on nuclear disarmament now before us supports nuclear disarmament. It is based on a bold understanding of nuclear disarmament similar to that of the Non-Aligned Movement and calls for the international community to proceed with its first resolution on nuclear disarmament which was adopted in 1946. Apart from welcoming the positive results of the Sixth Review Conference of the NPT in 2000, particularly the commitment by nuclear-weapon States to completely eliminate their nuclear arsenals, the draft also recognizes that the conditions now exist to create a nuclear-weapon-free world. The draft considers it necessary to reduce the role of nuclear weapons in

politics and in security policies as well, in order to facilitate the elimination of such weapons.

The draft resolution proposes a number of measures, practical and relevant, to clear the way so that we may proceed towards our noble objective of banning nuclear weapons.

As far as my delegation is concerned, convening an international nuclear disarmament conference, and establishing an ad hoc committee in 2004 on nuclear disarmament, opening negotiations to draft a treaty on fissile materials and, while waiting for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, to conclude a binding legal instrument on security guarantees for non-nuclear States — all of these are proposals that can help to completely eliminate nuclear arsenals.

These measures reflect our understanding of nuclear disarmament which must free mankind from the threat of extinction and must also make available resources currently used on weapons for the purposes of economic and social development.

We support the draft resolution and we restate our firm commitment to nuclear disarmament which is the only healthy option for future generations.

Accordingly, my delegation supports the draft resolution and calls for all delegations to support it. Along the same lines, we would like to say that we fully support the draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.31 with regard to an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice on the legality of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. This was introduced by Malaysia and my country has been a sponsor of it for many years here in the First Committee. The draft resolution underscores the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice that there is an obligation to continue in good faith and to then complete negotiations on nuclear disarmament in all its aspects, under strict and effective international control. It urges all States to immediately comply with this obligation. My delegation would appeal to all delegations to give their full support to draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.31.

Mr. Buffa (Paraguay) *(spoke in Spanish)*: My delegation supports the statement to be delivered by the delegation of Uruguay, on behalf of the Common Market of the South (MERCOSUR) on trafficking in small arms and light weapons. The Government of the Republic of Paraguay, aware of its international obligations and convinced that the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, adopted in July 2001 by the United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, is an effective tool to avoid having these weapons enter the illicit arms market beyond the control of Member States. With this in mind, Paraguay appealed to the Department for Disarmament Affairs of the United Nations for technical and financial assistance in order to destroy 2,615 firearms and 80,976 kilograms of munitions of various kinds.

Destruction of this material was carried out under stipulation 18, part of the measures envisaged by our nationwide plan which obliges Member States to review, periodically, the arsenals of small arms and light weapons of their own armed forces, national police forces and other authorized bodies, to see to it that any declared surplus be clearly announced and that programmes be established and carried out for their responsible elimination.

By the same token, hand in hand with the destruction of arms and munitions, my country held a seminar on the new challenge for the Republic of Paraguay in the fight to control, prevent, combat and eliminate the illicit trafficking in firearms, munitions and explosives. This seminar was aimed at the representatives of the judiciary, public ministries, the armed forces, the national police and the customs directorate, as well as all institutions involved in the implementation of law 1910/02 covering firearms, munitions and explosives.

My delegation should like to express its appreciation to the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean for the professionalism and efficiency the members of the mission displayed. For over a month they worked tirelessly so that events on the destruction of weapons and munitions, as well as other events developed unofficially, were carried out in transparency and with success.

We are aware that there is still a long way to go before United Nations assistance through its Regional Centre will make it possible to carry out further firearms destruction exercises, improve our approaches to stockpiling, and carry out training courses for attorneys, judges, law enforcement, civil society, and above all, to see to it that a tracking centre for firearms,

so necessary in our country and subregion, be established.

In conclusion, my delegation should like to point out that to find a lasting solution to these problems, we must act with shared responsibility, placing special emphasis on an effective control on the manufacturing and transfer of small arms.

Mr. Maandi (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): It is a great honour for me to introduce in the First Committee the draft resolution entitled, "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region", which is to be found in document A/C.1/58/L.42, and I do so on behalf of the following sponsors: Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritania, Monaco, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, as well as Zambia and Zimbabwe, two countries that have been kind enough to lend their valuable support to our draft resolution.

This draft resolution is regularly introduced here, and it reflects our commitment to strengthening cooperation and security in the Mediterranean region. It also bears witness to our joint resolve to cooperate through constructive dialogue in establishing a genuine partnership and building a stable, peaceful and prosperous Mediterranean region for the benefit of all the peoples of the region.

This is our fundamental goal, and it derives quite legitimately from the many deep ties that have been woven over the centuries by us, for we belong to the same geographic area, and there is a strong tradition of trade among our peoples. This is also a strategic choice that responds to the concerns and legitimate hopes of the peoples on both shores of the Mediterranean. We seek to make the Mediterranean a true lake of peace and cooperation, and to make use of the enormous reserve of complementarity that exists there for the true mutual interests of all of our peoples.

The 1995 Barcelona Conference laid the foundation for a new relationship based on partnership and community of interests. It recognized the nature of Euro-Mediterranean relations and underlined the need for collective action to give true content to cooperation that can reduce development inequalities and gaps that do separate the two shores of the Mediterranean, and also establish an atmosphere of understanding and fertile and constructive dialogue between the cultures and the people of the Mediterranean.

Other frameworks for dialogue and reaching agreement, as well as various ministerial meetings have been held subsequently, and they have given a new impetus to the Euro-Mediterranean dynamics by giving it a global and balanced approach.

The draft is similar to resolution 57/99, adopted last year, and deals with a large range of issues related to strengthening security and cooperation in the Mediterranean. In the preamble, the draft recalls all of the initiatives taken by Mediterranean countries to strengthen peace, security and cooperation in the Mediterranean. It also reaffirms all States' duty to contribute to stability and prosperity of the Mediterranean region, as well as their commitment to respect the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the provisions of the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States.

While stressing the indivisibility of security in the Mediterranean, the draft notes that peace negotiations in the Middle East, which should be global, are an appropriate framework for the peaceful settlement of disputes in the region. In its operative part, the draft states in paragraph 2, the fundamental principles underlying efforts by Mediterranean countries to eliminate all causes of tension in the region, and resolve in a peaceful, just and lasting way, problems that do exist.

In operative paragraph 4, the draft reiterates the view that eliminating economic and social disparities relating to unequal development, promoting mutual respect and better understanding among the cultures of the Mediterranean region help to strengthen peace, security and cooperation among the countries there.

In operative paragraph 5, dealing with disarmament, the draft calls on States in the region that have not yet done so to adhere to all the legal instruments relating to disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation negotiated within the multilateral context, and in paragraph operative 6, it encourages all States to

promote confidence-building measures, openness and transparency.

In operative paragraph 7, all States in the Mediterranean are encouraged to strengthen further their cooperation to combat terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, taking into account the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, as well as to combat organized crime, illegal arms trafficking, drug production and trafficking, all of which are a threat to peace and stability.

As in past years, the sponsors trust that this draft will be supported by all members of this Committee and that the draft can thus be adopted without a vote.

Mr. Hussin (Malaysia): It is an honour for my delegation to introduce to the Committee a draft resolution entitled, "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons," as contained in document A/C.1/58/L.31.

The draft resolution is sponsored by the following delegations, namely, Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Tonga, Viet Nam and Zambia. My delegation expresses its gratitude to all the sponsors, as well as to those delegations that may decide to sponsor or support the draft resolution.

The Advisory Opinion on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons issued by the International Court of Justice (ICJ) on 8 July 1996 remains a historic and resolute decision in the field of nuclear disarmament. The decision of the Court constitutes an authoritative legal call to rid the world of nuclear weapons. The Court's unanimous conclusion that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective control, continues to be replicated in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. Operative paragraph 2 underlines the obligation of all States to conduct and successfully conclude negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament. The unanimous decision is also consistent with the solemn obligation of States parties under Article VI of the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The sponsors of this draft resolution consider that the decision by the ICJ must be followed up by concrete action by all Member States of the United Nations.

There is a clearly a crisis of confidence in the area of nuclear disarmament. Little progress has been achieved towards nuclear disarmament over the past year. Large stocks of nuclear weapons remain in the arsenals of the nuclear-weapon States. Furthermore, there are plans by nuclear-weapon States to build new nuclear weapons, as well as plans for their possible use in future military conflicts. The international community has also witnessed the decision by a State party to withdraw from the NPT. The lack of progress in the field of nuclear disarmament is disheartening. The sponsors felt compelled to reiterate the commitment of the international community to the goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons and the creation of a nuclear-free world, a goal we affirmed 25 years ago at the first special session on disarmament. In this connection, we call on all Member States to implement in good faith the provisions of the draft resolution upon its adoption, in accordance with the resolve expressed by our leaders at the Millennium Summit, as well as our Treaty obligations, namely to strive for the elimination of these weapons.

The challenge facing the international community in trying to realize a nuclear-weapon-free world has become more formidable than ever, requiring our full and unqualified commitment to the goals we set ourselves. The world has promulgated legal treaties banning the use, threat and production of other weapons of mass destruction. Yet, the final goal of eliminating nuclear weapons has been elusive. However, we must not falter. We must work towards the elimination of nuclear weapons but with a clear target — one that is foreseeable, realistic and attainable. We cannot allow the indefinite perpetuation of the possession of such weapons. Towards this end, therefore, nuclear disarmament must remain a high priority issue on the global agenda, and not be sidelined or marginalized. Governments must support multilateral efforts that seek to bring all countries together in a multilateral effort to create a nuclear-free world. The vitality of multilateralism and multilaterally

agreed solutions in addressing disarmament and international security issues must be preserved and strengthened.

In submitting this draft resolution for the consideration of Member States, my delegation is confident that it will continue to receive the support of a large majority of Member States. We are confident that States that support multilateral negotiations will heed the views of the overwhelming majority inside and outside this Hall and seek to join us in our collective endeavour towards the global elimination of nuclear weapons. Once again, my delegation expresses its sincere appreciation to the sponsors, as well as to delegations that will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Ms. Laohaphan (Thailand): I take the floor to introduce the draft resolution entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction", as contained in document A/C.1/58/L.43. The draft resolution is already co-sponsored by 144 countries. The names of most of the sponsors appear on printed text. Additional sponsors, whose names do not yet appear on the printed text are: Papua New Guinea, Somalia, Monaco, Saint Lucia, Cape Verde, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Gambia, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Albania, Guinea-Bissau, Chad, Belize, Rwanda, Dominica, Comoros, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Cameroon, Samoa, Seychelles, Vanuatu, Djibouti, Ghana and Belarus. I am proud to report that a number of non-signatory States have also joined the sponsors' list, namely, Bhutan, Papua New Guinea, Somalia, Tonga and Tuvalu. A number of signatory States that have not yet ratified the Convention have also co-sponsored the draft, namely, Brunei Darussalam, Haiti, Poland and Vanuatu. This high number of sponsors reflects the fact that the humanitarian objectives of the Anti-personnel Mine-Ban Convention are recognized and shared by the majority of States. My delegation would therefore like to place on record our thanks and appreciation to all the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.43.

Draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.43 is based mainly on resolution 57/74 of 22 November 2002 and has been updated to reflect the result of the Fifth Meeting of States Parties to the Anti-personnel Mine-Ban Convention, held in Bangkok, Thailand, from 15 to 19 September 2003. The Meeting was attended by over 600 representatives of States parties and States not parties to the Convention, United Nations agencies, international organizations, and non-governmental organizations. The Meeting, which brought the Anti-personnel Mine-Ban Convention to Asia for the first time, achieved in highlighting the serious threat of anti-personnel mines to human security and its devastating humanitarian impacts. The Meeting also helped raise awareness of the public and the leaders in the region. The results of the Meeting are cited in the tenth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, in which the General Assembly recalls the Fifth Meeting of States Parties, which committed States parties to pursue efforts, with renewed vigour, to clear mined areas, assist victims, destroy stockpiled anti-personnel mines and promote universal adherence to the Convention.

The Fifth Meeting of States Parties was convened at a critical juncture in the life of the Convention. Four years after its entry into force, the Convention has proved that multilateralism works, with 141 countries having joined the Convention, a significant increase from the 129 States parties last year when a draft resolution on this same topic was presented to the First Committee. Since the Fifth Meeting of States Parties, held in September this year, five countries have joined the Convention, namely, Serbia and Montenegro, Greece, Turkey, Sudan and Burundi. This is progress that we can take pride in and we must ensure that implementation of the Convention is pursued actively, despite various constraints. It is also noteworthy that, now, over 110 States do not possess stockpiled anti-personnel mines, including 50 States that have completed stockpile destruction. Altogether, over 31 million anti-personnel mines have been destroyed. Costa Rica was the first country to report the completion of mine clearance. Other States parties are also vigorously undertaking their obligations. A considerable amount of land has been cleared of anti-personnel mines and there has been a reduction in the number of new victims in some of the world's most mine-affected States.

Yet, while recognizing the success of the Convention, the Fifth Meeting of States Parties remained deeply concerned that anti-personnel mines continue to kill, maim, and threaten the lives of countless innocent people each day, causing human suffering and impeding development. The terror of mines prevents individuals from reclaiming their lives. The lasting impact of those weapons denies

communities the opportunity to rebuild, long after conflicts have ended. In operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly renews its call upon all States and other relevant parties to work together to promote, support and advance the care, rehabilitation and social and economic reintegration of mine victims, mine risk education programmes, and the removal of anti-personnel mines and the assurance of their destruction.

Operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution invites all States that have not signed the Convention to accede to it without delay. Operative paragraph 2 urges all States that have signed but have not ratified the Convention to ratify it without delay. Operative paragraph 3 stresses the importance of the full and effective implementation of, and compliance with, the Convention. The Fifth Meeting of States Parties also envisaged more active involvement on the part of States not parties to the Convention. States not parties to the Convention that share the humanitarian objective of the Convention can share their experiences and technology or can even assist States parties in dealing with constraints in stockpile destruction, mine clearance, and victim assistance. The Fifth Meeting of States Parties also emphasized the importance of regional efforts and initiatives to promote the universal acceptance of the Convention.

The Fifth Meeting of States Parties also decided to hold the First Review Conference of the Convention at Nairobi, Kenya, from 29 November to 3 December 2004. Operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution requests the Secretary-General, in accordance with article 12, paragraph 1, of the Convention, to undertake the preparations necessary to convene the First Review Conference. Operative paragraph 9 requests the Secretary-General, on behalf of the States parties and in accordance with article 12, paragraph 3, of the Convention, to invite States not parties to the Convention, as well as the United Nations, other relevant international organizations or institutions, regional organizations, the International Committee of the Red Cross and relevant non-governmental organizations, to attend the First Review Conference as observers, and urges participation at the highest possible level in a high-level segment to be held at the end of the Review Conference.

Given the humanitarian nature of the Convention, we hope that the draft resolution will enjoy the widest support possible from States parties, as well as States not parties to the Convention. We also urge States not parties to the Convention to consider voting in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. Oyugi (Kenya): I take the floor to convey my delegation's full support for draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.43 on the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, which has just been introduced by the delegation of Thailand.

We wish to express our gratitude to the delegation of Thailand for its efforts in presenting a text of the draft resolution and mobilizing support for it. We are happy to note the growing support for this draft resolution, especially from non-signatory States. We look forward to having all of them on board the Convention at the earliest opportunity.

Anti-personnel landmines are some of the most inhuman weapons devised by man. Not only do they maim and kill innocent civilians, they also directly contribute to the perpetuation of poverty and underdevelopment in the affected regions. We therefore urge those countries that continue to produce, acquire, use, stockpile or transfer anti-personnel mines to put an early end to such activities and join the international community in eradicating those deadly weapons.

Despite the extreme suffering caused by such landmines, we are encouraged by the successful conclusion of the Fifth Meeting of States Parties to the Convention, which was held at Bangkok from 15 to 19 September this year. Here again we are grateful to the Government of Thailand for the formative work of hosting a highly successful meeting. The Bangkok Meeting brought together most of the 141 States that have ratified the Convention and was an inspiring example of what multilateralism can achieve when the positive collective will is mobilized.

It is instructive that the Conference was attended not only by the major mine-affected countries, but also by all major advocates of mine clearance, humanitarian organizations, non-governmental organizations and victim-assistance groups.

The Fifth Meeting of States Parties was testament to the burning desire of most of the United Nations members, especially those most affected by mines, to collectively and conclusively address the landmines dilemma and implement the Ottawa Convention.

The Convention has, to date, positively tackled several mine issues. The achievements include extensive demining, in which over 30 million mines have been destroyed by States parties. Stockpile destruction deadlines have been met by many concerned parties, and massive reduction of casualties attained.

A high level of political and resource mobilization has also been achieved to ensure the completion of the task. In this connection, I am pleased to report that Kenya completed the destruction of its entire stockpile of 35,774 assorted anti-personnel mines in August, this year. This is two years ahead of our deadline for destruction. We also continue to submit our article 7 report in a timely and regular manner, as required under the Convention.

Kenya is delighted to host the First Review Conference of States Parties to the Convention, which will be held at Nairobi from 29 November to 3 December next year. My delegation attaches considerable importance to this Conference, as it will enable us to review our achievements, assess where we stand vis-à-vis the requirements of the Convention, and chart the way forward.

We therefore thank all those delegations that have already emphasized their commitment to ensuring a successful 2004 Review Conference in Nairobi, and invite all States and organizations to participate at the highest possible level. In preparation for the Conference, two preparatory committee sessions will be held in Geneva in February and June next year.

We urge all States parties, as well as other organizations and actors, to take full advantage and participate actively in these sessions. It is crucial that we all work closely and generate innovative but practical ideas for the Review Conference.

Mr. Kment (Austria): I am taking the floor to express our full support for draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.43, which has just been introduced by Thailand, and we would like to thank the Thai delegation for its efforts.

Austria is a sponsor of this draft resolution and we are very pleased to note that an unprecedented high number of States have decided to co-sponsor the draft resolution.

This is a visible expression not only of the success of the Convention itself but also of the strength of the international norm against anti-personnel landmines that the Convention has established.

Anti-personnel mines are a weapon that cannot discriminate between combatants and innocent civilians. It is a weapon that causes terrible human suffering. One hundred and fifty States have acknowledged this and have outlawed the use, production, transfer and stockpiling of this terrible weapon. We strongly urge those States that have so far remained outside the Convention to change their position and to join in to the ever-growing broad consensus of the international community and to accede to the Convention. In this regard, we want to congratulate Turkey, Greece, Serbia and Montenegro, Sudan and Burundi for their recent ratifications and accessions.

This Convention is, however, not only a disarmament instrument. It also provides the framework for the solution of the problems caused by anti-personnel mines. States parties have committed themselves to clear mined land, to assist victims and to destroy stockpiles of anti-personnel landmines. During the past four years, impressive progress has been made towards the implementation of these objectives. Vast areas of mined land have been cleared and returned to civilians for productive use, survivors of landmine accidents have been assisted and many millions of stockpiled mines have been destroyed. Nevertheless, anti-personnel mines continue to be used and to cause human suffering and impede post-conflict development.

A lot still needs, therefore, to be done if we want to truly solve this problem. In order to continue to make strides in universalizing the norm of the Convention, more resources need to be mobilized so that the Convention's objectives can be achieved. These resources have to be used efficiently and in a coordinated manner. Mine action needs, therefore, to be integrated into the overall development strategies of affected States, as well as into the development assistance programmes of States in a position to provide such assistance.

The highly successful Fifth Meeting of States Parties, which took place recently in Bangkok, clearly highlighted those elements as priorities for our future work. The Bangkok Conference also took important decisions regarding the First Review Conference of the Convention, and we congratulate Kenya for having

been chosen to be the host country of this important event. We would also like to thank all States parties for the trust placed in Austria by having designated Ambassador Wolfgang Petritsch as President of the Convention's First Review Conference.

The President designate has recently sent out a food-for-thought paper to all States parties to the Convention, outlining a possible structure for our work in preparation of the Conference. It is important to start with this work as soon as possible, as time is of the essence. We will do our utmost to ensure that the Review Conference is successful but we will need the assistance of all concerned parties — States parties, international organizations and non-governmental organizations — in this effort. However, the success of the Conference and, indeed, of the whole Convention will be measured in the renewed commitment to solving the problem of anti-personnel mines once and for all. We can achieve this, if we continue to work in the same spirit of partnership that has so far characterized this process.

Mrs. Lundemo (Norway): My delegation takes the floor to express our strong support for draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.43, introduced this morning by Thailand.

I would like to voice Norway's strong support for the Mine-Ban Convention. It is a response to an urgent humanitarian challenge. Anti-personnel mines also constitute an obstacle to development and must be addressed within that context as well.

We are very pleased with the outcome of the Fifth Meeting of States Parties to the Convention, held in Bangkok last month, and take this opportunity to congratulate Thailand on a successful and well-organized meeting.

The Meeting also started preparations for the First Review Conference, which will be held in Nairobi next year. On that occasion, it will be of utmost importance that we all renew our political and financial commitment to the Convention. It is vital to engage all stakeholders, the mine-affected and other States parties, as well as the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, and other humanitarian and development actors. Norway has taken the initiative of establishing a resource mobilization contact group.

Like previous years, Norway has co-sponsored the draft resolution on the Mine-Ban Convention, and we are very happy to note the high number of sponsors this year.

Mr. Umer (Pakistan): I take great pleasure in introducing the draft resolution entitled "Confidence-building measures in the regional and subregional context", contained in document A/C.1/58/L.18. This is, as can be seen, a new initiative and has been mooted to address multiple factors that affect peace and security.

While the United Nations Charter depicts peace and security at the global and regional levels as the primary responsibility of the international community, in practice, tensions at the regional and subregional levels constitute the main source of instability. These tensions contribute to the arms race, endangering not only international peace and security but also undermining efforts aimed at arms control and disarmament.

Consequently, the spiralling arms race, particularly in regions of tension and conflict, obstructs peaceful settlement of disputes, rendering their resolution even more difficult. The bite of poverty spreads despair and anger, which are, in turn, channelled into destructive causes.

Another reason that encouraged this delegation to table the draft resolution is the overwhelming body of evidence that clearly establishes that the initiation of such confidence-building measures in tension-filled regions has paid tangible dividends for peace. By lowering tensions through these measures and the peaceful resolution of disputes, States can devote their resources and energies to the socio-economic advancement of their people. Such an approach could also supplement efforts for arms control and disarmament, since most threats to peace and stability in the post-cold-war era arise mainly among States located in the same region or subregion.

Regional arms races are the bane of development. The acquisition of military arsenals beyond the requirements of legitimate security is a prime cause of economic debilitation. There exists a symbiotic link between conflict and underdevelopment, between war and poverty. This insidious relationship must be broken in order to put an end to the suffering of vast segments of the human race. Regional arms races must stop

through the advancement of security at the lowest level of armament.

Accordingly, a combination of political and military confidence-building measures could help in strengthening peace and security, and also encourage regions in the grip of tension to take measures aimed at arms control and disarmament.

As a result of open-ended consultations with Member States and recognizing many of their concerns, our delegation feels that the draft resolution is representative of the aspirations of a wide section of the international community. It highlights several aspects of confidence-building measures. First, States locked in territorial and other disputes should adopt such measures in order to prevent armed conflict, through bilateral, subregional or regional dialogue. Secondly, renunciation of the use or threat of use of force and reaffirmation of the Charter principles listed under Chapter VI can facilitate the pacific settlements of disputes among States. Thirdly, the development of confidence-building measures can encourage the maintenance of military balance among the regional States and discourage the acquisition, development and deployment of various new weapon systems. Fourthly, confidence-building measures are needed to strengthen peace along borders, so as to avoid conflict and prevent the unintended or accidental outbreak of hostilities, particularly, in nuclearized theatres.

The preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution reiterate the basic purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, as well as General Assembly and Security Council resolutions relating to the prevention of armed conflicts. The draft resolution recognizes the need for peaceful dialogue in regions of tension in order to avoid conflict. It welcomes the peace processes already initiated in various regions to resolve disputes through peaceful means, bilaterally or through mediation by third parties. It also recognizes that regions that have already developed confidence-building measures at the bilateral, subregional or regional levels, in the political and military fields, including arms control and disarmament, have greatly improved the climate of peace and security in their respective regions and have contributed to the improvement of the socio-economic conditions of their people.

In its operative paragraphs, the draft resolution calls upon Member States to refrain from the use or threat of use of force, reaffirms the Assembly's commitment to the peaceful settlement of disputes under Chapter VI of the Charter, calls upon Member States to open consultations and dialogue in regions of tension without preconditions, urges strict compliance with bilateral, regional and international arms control and disarmament agreements to which the contending States are parties, urges the maintenance of military balance in the regions of tension, and encourages the promotion of bilateral and regional confidence-building measures to avoid conflict and prevent the unintended and accidental outbreak of hostilities.

The draft resolution also requests the Secretary-General to consult States in regions of tension and ascertain their views for promoting confidence-building measures. This thought is contained in operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, and I would like to explain it in a little more detail, because it has been the subject of comments from some quarters.

If read carefully, the paragraph asks the Secretary-General to consult the States of a region of tension and to open a process of consultation — not to impose anything, not to dictate anything, but merely, at an initial stage, to consult with the concerned Member States. The second step is to ascertain their views and find out what their thinking is. If there is tension in the region, is it not the responsibility of the Secretary-General to facilitate a solution to the situation? So, it is not intended to ask the Secretary-General to dictate any action, but only to elicit the views of the countries concerned.

The third aspect is to promote consultations among the Member States. This is a Charter-given responsibility of the Secretary-General, namely, to encourage consultations and dialogue among the concerned States of any particular region. He does this with a view to exploring possibilities. Again, it is the role of a facilitator to explore further avenues and possibilities in order to strengthen efforts leading up to confidence-building measures.

So, when read carefully, it is very clear that a number of qualifiers have been built into the text of this paragraph. A balance is struck between recognizing the sovereign will of States and enabling the Secretary-General, as mandated by the Charter, to continue the quest for peace in all parts of the world. It is in this context that paragraph 7 needs to be read.

Our delegation believes that this resolution serves all regions of tension and conflict by encouraging them to address their disputes in a peaceful manner and avert the spectre of war and destruction. As I said earlier, we have had open-ended consultations on this draft. We intend to continue these consultations, reflecting a very earnest desire to take on board, even at this stage, all reasonable and legitimate concerns. It is the expectation of our delegation that the text will ultimately be adopted with the full consent of this Committee.

Mr. Udedibia (Nigeria): I am taking the floor on behalf of the African Group to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/58/L.12, entitled "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes".

The dumping of radioactive wastes poses a serious threat to the security and development of all States. It constitutes a serious health hazard to inhabitants of the area in which they may be found, and is bound to be profoundly harmful to the environment.

Some developing countries, particularly the least developed countries, have been victims of dumping of radioactive wastes. Until the adoption by the General Assembly, at the initiative of the African Group, of the first resolution on the prohibition of the dumping of radioactive waste at its forty-third session in 1988, Africa had been a favourable destination for the transfer of radioactive wastes in search of territories in which to dump them.

Concerned about the serious effects of the dumping of radioactive wastes, it is the wish of the African Group that the international community, as represented at this meeting, should continue to sustain this draft resolution to protect States from the indiscriminate dumping of radioactive waste, which may infringe on their sovereignties.

The Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), now the African Union, had in 1988, and again in 1989, adopted resolutions concerning the dumping of nuclear and industrial waste in Africa. Since then, the international community has consistently recognized the need to address the issue of radioactive wastes. This is particularly the case for the International Atomic Energy Agency, which has responsibility for nuclear and radioactive matters.

On 21 September 1990, the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency, at its thirty-fourth regular session, adopted a resolution establishing a Code of Practice on the International Transboundary Movement of Radioactive Waste. Eleven years later, on 21 September 2001, the General Conference, at its forty-fifth regular session, adopted a resolution inviting States that engage in the shipment of radioactive materials to provide assurances, as appropriate, to concerned States upon their request that the national regulations of the shipping State take into account the Agency's transport regulations and to provide the concerned States with relevant information relating to shipment of such materials. That information should indicate in all cases that the shipment is in full compliance with the required measures of physical security and safety.

On 5 September 1997, in Vienna, the Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management was adopted as recommended by participants at the 1996 Moscow Summit on Nuclear Safety and Security.

In the draft resolution being introduced, the General Assembly calls upon all States to take appropriate measures with a view to preventing any dumping of nuclear or radioactive wastes that would infringe upon the sovereignty of States. It expresses grave concern regarding any use of nuclear wastes that might constitute radiological warfare and have grave implications for the national security of all States. The draft resolution also requests the Conference on Disarmament to intensify efforts towards the early conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of radiological weapons, with radioactive waste as part of this convention. The General Assembly would take note of the adoption by members of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) Council of Ministers in 1991 of the Bamako Convention on the Ban of the Import into Africa and the Control of Transboundary Movement and Management of Hazardous Wastes within Africa.

The draft resolution expresses the hope that effective implementation of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Code of Practice on the International Transboundary Movement of Radioactive Waste will enhance the protection of all States from the dumping of radioactive waste on their territories.

Finally, the draft resolution appeals to all Member States that have not yet taken the necessary steps to

become party to the Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management to do so as soon as possible.

With the exception of technical updates, the elements of the draft resolution are the same as the one adopted at the fifty-sixth session of the General Assembly. The draft resolution has always been adopted without a vote by the First Committee and by the General Assembly. The African Group would, therefore, appreciate the cooperation of all delegations in adopting this draft resolution without a vote again at this session.

Mr. Heinsberg (Germany): My delegation would like to return to the draft resolution on the report of the Conference on Disarmament, draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.5, which was introduced yesterday.

My delegation would like to thank the Japanese presidency of the Conference on Disarmament, Ambassador Inoguchi, for introducing that forward-looking resolution on the report of the Conference on Disarmament. At the same time, I have to express the deep disappointment and concern of Germany about the current state of affairs within the Conference on Disarmament. Germany deeply deplores the ongoing stalemate in the Conference on Disarmament, which has brought the fruitful work of this global forum, which has the negotiating mandate for disarmament and arms control, to a halt. We are convinced that the new threats to peace and security require that this unacceptable standstill of the Conference on Disarmament be overcome without delay. There are no easy excuses.

Those maintaining linkages between different subjects on the agenda, or refusing to enter into an open dialogue on all subjects of the agenda, are not living up to their responsibility and will have to bear the blame for blocking useful work. One-sided approaches, with some members of the Conference on Disarmament only pursuing their own hobbyhorses and pointedly refusing to consider other concerns raised, are no longer tolerable. This is not effective multilateralism, but myopia. Germany is committed to reaching consensus on a programme of work in the Conference on Disarmament and is ready to begin substantive work from the outset at the first session in 2004. We hope that, in light of recent movement in the Conference on Disarmament, it will be possible to take up substantive work early next year, and we sincerely hope that the draft resolution, which "stresses the urgent substantive need for the Conference to commence work on its agreed agenda items at this juncture", will be taken literally by the member States of the Conference on Disarmament.

Mr. Caughley (New Zealand): We welcome the efforts by Canada to initiate a debate on verification in disarmament and, as a strong supporter of the biennial Canadian draft resolution entitled: "Verification in all its aspects, including the role of the United Nations in the field of verification", would like to offer a few thoughts on that topic.

In the current, highly unsettled security environment, there is a greater need than ever before for effective and robust verification mechanisms. While there is not yet consensus on the way forward for strengthening verification mechanisms and ensuring full compliance, we, nonetheless, welcome this debate as an opportunity to explore what is at stake for the international community. An argument raised against the establishment of verification mechanisms is that rapidly evolving technology means it would be impossible for any one mechanism to keep abreast of all new threats. We accept the point that threats from chemical and biological weapons are not static and will continue to evolve, but that is an argument that cuts both ways. While new threats may be emerging, verification technology is always being updated and improved.

The advancement of new threats is not a reason for discarding multilateral mechanisms. Instead, we believe that that is a reason for urgently renewing the international community's commitment to verification regimes. In the face of new threats, it is surely preferable to have States working together to support verification mechanisms. Not all States have the resources to monitor compliance issues. International institutions that can be constantly focused on this task add a further layer of protection.

Another argument that has been advanced against multilateral mechanisms is that the security of States is a sensitive issue and bringing such issues into multilateral forums can only alert potential proliferators who are non-State actors to potential gaps in defence regimes. In responding to this argument, we need to face the reality that information is now easier to access and exchange. Alerting States to potential

problems and ensuring that we have effective institutions in place to monitor adverse developments is a constructive and effective avenue for addressing those threats. In addition, we recognize that there can be shades of opinion on the objectivity of any independent body in this area. No one institution is going to be flawless and, hence, States must continuously scrutinize the work of such bodies and hold them to account for their findings. But this is part and parcel of mustering all of the multilateral tools at our disposal to counteract the threat of weapons of mass destruction.

We also acknowledge that establishing institutions that are responsible for verification can be costly and time-consuming. However, when international security is at stake, it is in all of our interests to ensure such institutions are sufficiently well resourced. We also note in this regard the professional work carried out by the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC) in Iraq, despite limited resources.

New Zealand strongly supports the work of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). This is an example of an institution, that all of its member States rely on to provide thorough and independent assurances that nuclear materials are being used properly and safely in accordance with international commitments. We especially appreciate the efforts of the Agency to undertake regular reviews of procedure, with a view to increasing the efficiency and accuracy of the organization.

Any verification mechanism will only be as strong as the will of the international community supporting it. That is the reason why in our general statement we called on States to fully cooperate with the relevant institutions in resolving compliance concerns, and on States to allow the process of inspection and deliberation to run their full course. We strongly support the sixteen principles of verification and underline principle 2, that verification is not an aim in itself. Real security against weapons of mass destruction requires all States and individuals to vigorously enforce the treaties, rules, laws and procedures that have been established to outlaw proliferation of chemical, biological and nuclear weapons.

Mr. Fraser (Canada): I would like to take the floor briefly to address a theme of profound importance to Canada, that of disarmament education.

At its fifty-seventh session one year ago, this Committee adopted by consensus a biennial resolution entitled "United Nations study on disarmament and non-proliferation education" (A/C.1/57/L.7). The resolution reaffirmed the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation and the commitment of Member States to take concrete steps in order to strengthen that role. It welcomed the United Nations study prepared by the Secretary-General with the assistance of governmental experts and agreed that the need has never been greater for disarmament and non-proliferation education. It also recognized the importance of the role of civil society in the promotion of disarmament and non-proliferation education.

Canada was pleased to sponsor that consensus resolution and I would like to take this opportunity to inform the Committee on steps Canada has taken to support its implementation. My Government has long recognized the value — indeed the indispensable contribution — of research and education in areas of international security. The Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade's International Security Research and Outreach Programme (ISROP) constitutes a focal point for original research and assessment relevant to international security issues, including non-proliferation; arms control and disarmament; verification and confidence-building measures. The Programme draws together in-house research capability, resources from other Government departments and a network of expertise from the academic community and other knowledgeable individuals in Canada and abroad. ISROP provides up-to-date, objective information and encourages the exchange of views on international security matters through web-based and other publications accessible to the public. Long-time First Committee participants will undoubtedly recall the numerous ISROP publications that Canada has made available on a variety of non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament issues over the last 15 or more years.

This past August, ISROP was proud to launch the Graduate Research Awards for Disarmament, Arms Control and Non-Proliferation, in partnership with The Simons Centre for Peace and Disarmament Studies at the University of British Columbia. The primary objective of the Awards is to enhance Canadian

graduate-level scholarship on non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament issues. They signal the importance Canada attaches to the contribution of academia and civil society in developing centres of knowledge and expertise that can contribute to our disarmament and non-proliferation objectives. Details about the Graduate Research Awards, as well as ISROP, are available for interested delegations.

My Government is also in the process of finalizing its contribution towards an ambitious project, in partnership with the United Nations Association of Canada (UNAC). We are hopeful that UNAC will soon launch a comprehensive disarmament education programme intended for students and teachers at the secondary school level across Canada. That project holds great promise and goes far to capture the spirit at the core of the Secretary-General's report. It promotes the establishment of close collaboration between non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament experts and civil society, including educators and academic institutions at the secondary and tertiary levels of education. We look forward to returning to this important theme at next year's First Committee session.

Mr. Adji (Indonesia): I am taking the floor to express my delegation's strong support for draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.47, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", sponsored by Myanmar.

To the concern of many Member States, the discussion of nuclear disarmament in the First Committee has this year, like last year, been steered increasingly towards an emphasis on non-proliferation and nuclear terrorism and has effectively overshadowed the objective of nuclear disarmament, particularly with respect to compliance with existing treaties. In the Final Document of the Thirteenth Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), held in Kuala Lumpur, my delegation, along with other NAM delegations, reiterated once again our principle positions on nuclear disarmament and the related issue of nuclear non-proliferation.

We are concerned over the lack of progress and underscore the need to achieve the goal of nuclear disarmament through the commencement of deliberations and negotiations without delay in the relevant disarmament bodies, such as the First Committee, the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament. Furthermore, we consider the indefinite possession of nuclear weapons by the nuclear-weapon States, as well as the States with nuclear-weapon capability, to be a continued threat to the security and survival of humanity. My delegation has therefore joined with a number of the other delegations of Non-Aligned Movement countries in sponsoring the draft resolution on nuclear disarmament, which was recently introduced by Myanmar.

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I should like to make a brief statement on two items on the agenda of the fifty-eighth session: agenda item 70, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", and item 76, "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East".

The Russian Federation is seriously concerned at the alarming turn of events in the Middle East. Mounting tension in the region is seriously harming all parties to the conflict and efforts at a Middle East settlement. It is our view that to ensure stability in the region we must have a comprehensive approach. In that context, we support the proposal to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the area of the Middle East. We also take the view that adoption of that proposal will contribute to ensuring the universalization of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and contribute to Israel's becoming a party to it.

On the whole, we believe that the international community must act more forcefully to prevent the worst-case scenario from being realized, while also taking practical steps to further a process designed to bring about a peaceful settlement. We consider the most urgent and important task at hand to be the earliest possible implementation of the road map elaborated by the Quartet and its adoption by both sides. In accordance with that view, at a ministerial-level meeting of the Quartet in New York held on 26 September, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Mr. Ivanov, presented an initiative for the adoption of a special Security Council resolution endorsing the road map. We intend to carry out that initiative in the very near future.

Ms. Rivero (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): I have the honour of speaking on behalf of the member States of MERCOSUR — Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay and Paraguay, as well as the associated countries of Bolivia and Chile, to address the Convention on the Prohibition

of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction and the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction.

As to the first, the Chemical Weapons Convention, this instrument is one of the fundamental pillars in the struggle against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The commitment of MERCOSUR and its associated countries was demonstrated by their ratification of the Convention, and I am gratified to say that in our subregion there are no weapons of mass destruction of any kind. The ultimate aim of the Chemical Weapons Convention is not only the permanent elimination of such weapons, their stockpiles and facilities, but also the control of such weapons through inspection and verification of chemical activities carried out by States parties, including those involving substances and precursors that might help directly or indirectly in the development of chemical weapons. Moreover, at a time when the international community is threatened by a type of terrorism that appears to be determined to use weapons of mass destruction in order to sow hatred and destruction, that objective is of particular importance.

Five years after the entry into force of this Convention, it is important to point out the progress in its implementation as a result of the international efforts undertaken by the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) and the States parties to the Convention.

We hope that in the near future a total elimination of chemical weapons can be achieved through destruction of existing arsenals, recycling of related facilities and the implementation of measures by States to strengthen their policies of non-proliferation.

We should like to highlight as well the relevant role of the Organization in achieving gradually the incorporation of new States into the Convention; however, this process will also require the political will of the international community in attaining the universality of this instrument, a goal which must be pursued.

Furthermore, in order to achieve real effectiveness, it is necessary to follow up on the process of implementation of the Convention by States, in particular, the adoption of domestic legislation and the creation of punitive legislation that may guarantee compliance with and the effectiveness of the Convention.

In this regard, we consider it essential to adapt the mechanisms necessary to strengthen the control of the transfer of chemical substances and their precursors, and to achieve better understanding and cooperation among States towards solving eventual discrepancies in their declarations.

On the other hand, we must emphasize the need for global commitment in order to obtain a policy of transparency in the chemical activities carried out by States parties that must be reflected both in their declarations as well as during the course of inspections carried out by OPCW. A regional balance is required in inspections of States parties and in the relevant responsibilities of OPCW.

We believe that it is important to point out the need to promote the approach and coordination among customs offices and authorities in order to create a collective effort undertaken by those institutions in charge of monitoring and security, to create and use the machinery for cooperation and international assistance in order to prevent the use of any prohibited substance, and to create rapid response machinery to act when faced with the abuse of such substances or when a chemical weapons attack takes place.

With regard to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction, it is important to point out the task undertaken by the Group of Governmental Experts under the chairmanship of Ambassador Tibor Toth, during the last meeting, held in Geneva from 18 to 29 August 2003.

MERCOSUR and associated countries support the results of these meetings, which reflect the efforts of the international community to achieve control over activities involving biotechnology with a view to a future binding agreement among all States.

Bringing together the global determination to promote economic and social cooperation in scientific and technological development — bilaterally or multilaterally — and the exchange of information, material and experts in relevant fields are all fundamental needs for progress among peoples.

Furthermore, in order to achieve a better approach and cooperation among States, it is a priority to adopt measures at the national level to implement the prohibitions contained in the Convention with a view to implementing a national security and monitoring machinery to monitor micro-organisms, both pathogenic and toxigenic.

MERCOSUR and its associated member countries hope that in the near future universalization of the Convention on the Prohibition of Biological Weapons will be achieved; that States parties will observe transparency in the transfer of the peaceful use of technology without discrimination; that training programmes based upon agreements for development and application of biotechnology will be promoted; and that the creation of an international databank will be created to facilitate information exchange in the field of genetic biotechnology.

Finally, we wish to stress the importance of strengthening national and international efforts and existing machinery to supervise , detect, diagnose and combat infectious diseases that afflict human beings, plants and animals alike.

Mr. Shaw (Australia): We would like to congratulate Thailand on its successful hosting of the Fifth Meeting of States Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction. We were particularly pleased by the active participation of so many States parties at the Bangkok meeting and we were encouraged by the participation of a number of observers which we call on to join the Convention as soon as possible.

More still needs to be done to address the impacts of anti-personnel mines in Asia. In that context, the holding of the meeting in Asia drew the attention of all to the scale of the problem in Asia. Universalization of the Convention and mine action remain key priorities for Australia. In this regard, we welcome recent progress on universalization, noting that the Landmine Convention now has 140 State parties; we urge all States in Asia and the Pacific, in particular, that have not yet acceded to the Convention to do so.

In conclusion, Australia is pleased, once again, to sponsor the First Committee resolution on this vital issue, document A/C.1/58/L.43.

Mr. Rivasseau (France) (*spoke in French*): I would like to speak on the questions of disarmament machinery, complementing the very stimulating statements made about the Conference on Disarmament by various representatives, particularly the Ambassadors of Poland, Germany and Austria.

I would like to speak briefly about the situation in the Conference on Disarmament. The report of the Conference on Disarmament is likely to be adopted this year without a vote as has happened in past years. I welcome this, particularly since the draft resolution introduced by Japan on this matter has more substance in it than it has in past years.

France believes in multilateralism, and we would like the Conference on Disarmament to survive because the expertise in that forum is unique. It is the only forum where member States can negotiate on a true footing of equality. But since 1998, the Conference on Disarmament has been meeting without being able to agree as to what it should be doing.

Outside the Conference on Disarmament, the world is changing very fast, and it will not wait for the Conference on Disarmament. So should we just sit back and accept this lack of movement, this paralysis? One French philosopher some years ago said that each age is marked by an approach of collective waiting, that gives meaning to the world and that motivates men and women of good will. This applies to people and to the institutions that they set up to meet their needs. The Conference on Disarmament has done great things in the past; it should not stay outside our horizon of waiting.

And for that, we must respond to simple, but crucial questions: What are the threats we face today? What do we want in security today in 2003? How can we meet expectations?

France believes that without abandoning our traditional priorities, we should also introduce into our discussions a sense of what is topical today, thereby make the Conference on Disarmament more in touch with the true needs of the today's world. I would refer to just a few of the burning issues, including weapons of mass destruction and their proliferation, terrorism, respect for and implementation of treaties, verification, and the assessment of new types of threats. These are all topics to which the Conference on Disarmament should make a contribution of some sort in the immediate term. France is among several delegations,

representing all the groups within the Conference, that have wanted to see that happen.

We must think not only about new topics, but also about new working methods to bring them to life, allowing us to achieve concrete results to the benefit of the international community. That is the only way we will be able to perform useful work. We should not seek agreement on a programme of work merely for the pure intellectual pleasure of extracting ourselves from the intractable problems to which General De Gaulle alluded 40 years ago in connection with the Conference on Disarmament's programme of work. This is first and foremost a question of doing work that will improve international security on the ground, for it is by that measure that we will be judged.

Mr. Oyugi (Kenya): My delegation would like to support draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.1 on the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects, introduced by the representatives of South Africa, Japan and Colombia. We thank those delegations for their work.

My delegation would also like to align itself with the statement made on behalf of the African Group by the representative of Nigeria, under the item on conventional weapons.

Kenya assigns capital importance to the question of the illicit circulation of small arms and light weapons and is therefore a traditional supporter of today's draft resolution. We therefore urge all delegations also to support it.

We are grateful to the Secretary-General for his report in document A/58/138, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects". Small arms have helped fuel more than 90 per cent of the largest conflicts of the last decade, killing and maiming non-combatants and often leaving destitute the most vulnerable sectors of the community, namely women, children, the infirm and the aged. The illicit arms trade — unregulated, uncontrolled and untaxed — does not augment a country's economy or raise the living standards of its people.

In Africa, the devastating effects of small arms have been most profound in the Great Lakes and Horn of Africa regions. There, instability and competition for natural resources, among other things, have led to the multiplication of non-State actors, who in turn continue to undermine legitimate authorities in some parts of the region. The resultant conflicts and instability in its region have compelled Kenya to take decisive steps in bringing together 10 regional States collectively to address the problem. This effort gave birth to the Nairobi Declaration and its coordinated agenda for action. The Nairobi Declaration shares the basic features of the United Nations Programme of Action.

Some of the specific measures undertaken by the Government of Kenya to address the problem of illicit small arms and light weapons include the establishment of a national focal point to coordinate collective efforts towards implementing the action plan. We have also established a national steering committee to consolidate peace-building, conflict management and development, particularly amongst the local communities most affected by the proliferation of small arms along the common borders. Security sector reforms have also been undertaken better to facilitate community and police partnerships.

To further underscore its seriousness in the fight against this menace, Kenya has destroyed 8,062 assorted illicit small arms and light weapons as a demonstration of its commitment and resolve to address the problem. Kenya also participated actively in the United Nations First Biennial Meeting of States to Consider the Implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, which was held in New York in July.

As a country that has suffered greatly from an influx of small arms and light weapons, Kenya remains committed to the implementation of both the United Nations Programme of Action and the Nairobi plan of action. We believe that international assistance is crucial for the implementation of both plans of action, since illicit arms trafficking intrinsically thrives on loopholes created by divergent national policies regulating arms possession and transfers. Kenya therefore wishes to request more international support for collective regional and subregional initiatives.

We would also wish to see enhanced action aimed at addressing disarmament, demobilization, reintegration of combatants, improvement of surveillance mechanisms for arms transfers and reform of the security sectors. The assistance of the Conventional Arms Branch of the Department for Disarmament Affairs would be appreciated for project

design and mobilization of resources. It is also our hope that the French-Swiss initiative on tracing and marking will be augmented by other initiatives and that the current session will see the launching of negotiations on an international instrument that would be as comprehensive as possible both in scope and in application.

Finally, my delegation would, in addition, like to express its support for draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.12 on the prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes, introduced by the representative of Nigeria on behalf of the African Group. We urge all delegations to fully support this text in order that it be adopted by consensus.

Mr. Pant (Nepal): On behalf of the Chairman of the United Nations Disarmament Commission for 2003 and of the sponsors who are traditionally members of the expanded Bureau of the Commission, it is my distinct pleasure to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.20, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission".

This draft is the result of open-ended informal consultations among members of the Disarmament Commission. It has been prepared in a manner similar to that of previous resolutions regarding the Disarmament Commission, with appropriate changes in the text as this year's circumstances warrant. Those circumstances are well known to delegations and I will not dwell on them.

During the 2003 session, the Commission concluded its consideration of two agenda items — "Ways and means to achieve nuclear disarmament" and "Practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms". Accordingly, paragraph 5 reflects the fact that at present the agenda of the Commission is still open and will be decided n the course of the forthcoming organizational session and subsequent consultations, if need be.

As delegations remember, in its resolution 57/95 of 22 November 2002, the Commission decided to hold its sessions for a period not exceeding three weeks, in accordance with a 1998 decision on the rationalization of the work of the Commission. The present draft resolution, in its paragraph 6, reaffirms the normal practice of having a three-week substantive session of the Commission in 2003.

Now, allow me to say a few words about the activities of the Commission this year. As I mentioned earlier, the Commission held a three-week substantive session. The Chairpersons of the two working groups continued intensive informal consultations based on the discussions, situations and oral and written proposals and materials submitted during the previous two years of deliberations.

The Chairpersons also submitted a number of revised versions of their papers. Let me say that it is not an easy task to try to maintain the perfect balance of the differing interests and issues at the core of security concepts. Despite the inability of the Commission to reach a consensus on these important issues, I am pleased to point out to the First Committee that, during three years of deliberations, both Chairpersons met the challenge and presented papers that were considered a good basis for negotiations.

In this context, I would be remiss if I did not express my gratitude to both Chairpersons for their valiant efforts. I wish also to express my gratitude to delegations for their constructive spirit of cooperation. Of course it is a disappointment for all of us that, at the end of the day, it was not possible to overcome the few remaining obstacles to the successful conclusion of our work. I still hope that delegations will try to keep these issues alive and put to good use those positive elements that were attained and agreed upon. I believe I speak on behalf of all delegations when I express optimism as to the future work of the Commission during forthcoming sessions in 2004 and beyond.

Despite the inability to agree on a consensus document, the previous session has proven that, within the international disarmament community, there is a tremendous reserve of goodwill and readiness to search for common solutions to even the most difficult and intractable problems.

Before concluding my brief remarks, allow me to point out the following changes: the paragraphs dealing with the issue of further rationalization of the Commission's work were not included in the text of the proposed draft, since this subject was not addressed during the 2003 session. I hope that draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.20 will enjoy consensus support, as in the previous years.

Mr. Venkatesh (India): India has taken the floor to join other delegations who have spoken on the important subject of disarmament and non-proliferation

education. We join the delegations of Canada and New Zealand, which have made positive references to this important subject.

India believes that strengthening the societal dimensions of disarmament is an extremely important task in which academics, disarmament non-governmental organizations and activists on the ground play an extremely important part. Education brings together all these broad areas of activity.

We will have opportunity to come back to this theme next year to build on the very important and substantive recommendations that were included in the report that this Committee had an opportunity to study and adopt last year, and we join other delegations in their call to keep the focus on this important area of strengthening disarmament and non-proliferation education.

The Chairman: Is there any other delegation that wishes to take the floor at this stage? That does not seem to be the case.

We have thus concluded the second phase of the Committee's work. I would commend the Committee for the fact that all draft resolutions and draft decisions have in fact been introduced during this second phase of our work.

Programme of work

The Chairman: In accordance with the Committee's programme of work and timetable, the third and last phase of our work, namely, action on all draft resolutions and decisions submitted under agenda items 62 to 80, will begin next week.

In this connection, I would like to draw your attention to the clustering paper contained in document A/C.1/58/CRP.3, which was made available to all delegations yesterday.

The Committee will begin its work by taking action on those draft resolutions that are contained in cluster 1, on nuclear weapons, on Monday 27 October and, time permitting, will continue to draft resolutions under clusters 2, 3 and 4.

It is my intention, with your cooperation and on the basis of past practice and precedent, to move as efficiently as possible from one cluster to another upon the completion of action on each given cluster. Nonetheless, while following this procedure, the Committee will maintain a desirable degree of flexibility.

During the decision-taking stage on each individual cluster, delegations will first have the opportunity to introduce revised draft resolutions with regard to any particular cluster. Then, delegations wishing to make general statements or comments, other than explanations of votes on the draft resolutions contained in a specific cluster, will be permitted to do so.

Thereafter, delegations will be provided the opportunity to explain their positions or votes in a consolidated statement on all the draft resolutions and decisions contained in a particular cluster before the Committee proceeds to take action on them, one after another, without any interruption in between. In other words, delegations will have the chance to make explanations of their positions or votes in a consolidated fashion on all of the draft resolutions contained in the specific cluster on which action will be taken.

I intend, with your assistance and cooperation, to strictly follow this procedure in order to ensure the full and efficient utilization of the time and conference resources allocated to the Committee. This is something that I firmly believe all members of the Committee fully concur with. Consequently, I appeal to all delegations to kindly observe this procedure and to avoid any interruptions once voting on a cluster begins.

Once the Committee completes action on all draft resolutions and decisions contained in a particular cluster, those delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes after the vote will be allowed to do so. However, as with the consolidated explanations of vote before the vote, delegations are requested to provide consolidated explanations of their positions after the vote on those respective draft resolutions of the given cluster on which action was completed.

I would also like to stress that, in accordance with the rules of procedure, sponsors of draft resolutions are not permitted to make any statements in explanation of their votes either before or after action is taken. They will, however, be permitted to make only general statements at the beginning of the meeting on a particular cluster.

In order to avoid any misunderstandings, I strongly urge those delegations seeking recorded votes

on any particular draft resolution to kindly inform the Secretariat of their intention as early as possible, before the Committee starts taking action on any individual cluster.

Finally, concerning the deferment of action on any draft resolution, I urge all delegations to inform the Secretariat in advance, at least one day before action is taken on the draft resolution. Every effort, however, should be made to refrain from resorting to a postponement of action.

It is my intention, with the agreement of the Committee, to follow the procedure that I have just outlined during the third phase of our work.

May I take it that the Committee agrees to proceed accordingly? I hear no objection, it is so decided.

In order to efficiently utilize the remaining time and facilities allocated to the Committee, I count on the full cooperation of all delegations in order to enable the First Committee to conclude its work in a successful and constructive manner.

The draft resolutions that the Committee will act upon on Monday, 27 October, contained in cluster 1 on nuclear weapons, are as follows, and as indicated in informal paper No. 1, which has been circulated to all delegations in the course of this morning's meeting: A/C.1/58/L.2, A/C.1/58/L.4, A/C.1/58/L.6, A/C.1/58/L.8, A/C.1/58/L.12, A/C.1/58/L.14, A/C.1/58/L.22, A/C.1/58/L.34, A/C.1/58/L.36, A/C.1/58/L.38, A/C.1/58/L.49 and A/C.1/58/L.52.

We will then proceed to cluster 2, on other weapons of mass destruction, and act upon the draft resolutions: A/C.1/58/L.37 and A/C.1/58/L.41.

We will then proceed to cluster 3, "Outer space: disarmament aspects", to act upon draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.44.

Finally — of course, time permitting — we will proceed to cluster 4, on conventional weapons, and act upon draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.50.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following countries have joined the sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/58/L.1: Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Solomon Islands; A/C.1/58/L.8: the Solomon Islands and Viet Nam; A/C.1/58/L.12: Ecuador; A/C.1/58/L.15: the Marshall Islands and the Solomon Islands; A/C. 1/58/L.16: Bosnia and Herzegovina; A/C.1/58/L.17: the Solomon Islands; A/C.1/58/L.25: the Solomon Islands; A/C.1/58/L.31: Guyana and the Solomon Islands; A/C.1/58/L.34: Viet Nam; A/C.1/58/L.35: Ecuador and Georgia; A/C.1/58/L.36: Ecuador; A/C.1/58/L.38: Congo, Ecuador, Guyana and Viet Nam; A/C.1/58/L.39: the Solomon Islands; A/C.1/58/L.40: the Solomon Islands; A/C.1/58/L.42: Bosnia and Herzegovina; A/C.1/58/L.43: the Bahamas, the Comoros, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Grenada, Rwanda, Samoa, Seychelles and Vanuatu; A/C.1/58/L.45: Bosnia and Herzegovina and Timor-Leste; A/C.1/58/L.49: Serbia and Montenegro; A/C.1/58/L.50: Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Solomon Islands; A/C.1/58/L.51: Papua New Guinea; A/C.1/58/L.52: the Solomon Islands; and A/C.1/58/L.53: Ecuador, Honduras and Nepal.

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.